

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 5-7 have been withdrawn and claims 1-4 have been examined on the merits.

**Claim Rejections**

**A) Cesano**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cesano (EP 1153725). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an injection moulding area which comprises a chamber into which thermoplastic material is injected. Claim 1 also recites that the spacer means extend inside the chamber. For example, see the spacers 22 in the non-limiting embodiment of the specification shown in Figs. 1-7 extending inside a chamber of an injection moulding area.

The Examiner asserts that Cesano teaches an injection moulding area 18 and a spacing means 32. The alleged Cesano spacing means 32 may form a wall of the alleged moulding area 18. However, the spacing means 32 does not extend inside a chamber of the injection moulding area 18.

Spacing means extending in the chamber which receives the injected thermoplastic material solves the problem, for example, of the formation of inserts of thermoplastic material on a face of a thermosetting plate, when there is an extended area of contact between the insert and the plate. In this situation, the plate would fill the chamber of the injection moulding area, restricting the space available for the thermoplastic material to be injected. The provision of spacing means extending inside the chamber which receives the injected thermoplastic material keeps the thermosetting plate at a distance from the walls of the chamber, thereby leaving an

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

U.S. Appln. No. 10/628,483

Atty. Docket No. Q76511

open volume which is filled by the injected thermoplastic material. Since Cesano lacks spacing means which extend into a chamber of an injection moulding area, it would not provide such an advantage.

In view of the above, claim 1 is allowable over Cesano at least because Cesano lacks a spacer means extend inside the chamber of an injection moulding area as claimed.

**B) Kanai et al.**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,008,060). Applicant respectfully traverses.

As discussed above, claim 1 recites spacer means which extend inside the chamber of an injection moulding area. Like Cesano, Kanai lacks such a feature. As shown in Kanai Figs. 2(a)-2(c), the Examiner's alleged spacer means 6 do not extend into the alleged injection moulding area 7. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Kanai. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is therefore allowable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**C) Danielson et al.**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Danielson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2,609,570). Applicant respectfully traverses.

In addition to the above-mentioned recitations, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that each of the compression moulding surfaces comprises at least one surface other than the spacer means. For example, in non-limiting embodiment of Fig. 1 of the application illustrates that the half mold 12 has a moulding surface 16 other than the spacers 22. In contrast, the alleged compression moulding surface of the upper mold E in Danielson are the ends of the spacer pins 17 (*see* Fig.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 10/628,483  
Atty. Docket No. Q76511

3). Accordingly, one of the moulding surfaces in Danielson does not include a surface other than a spacer means and claim 1 is therefore allowable over Danielson.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**New Claim**

Applicant has added new claim 8 in order to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and is therefore allowable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 17, 2006



Stephen R. Valancius  
Registration No. 57,574